

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on January 31, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Claim(s) 1,5-7, 9, 11-15 and 23-28 and 30-34 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 5-7 and 11-15 have been withdrawn from consideration.

In this Amendment, claim(s) 23 and 31 have been amended and claims 27 and 33 have been cancelled.

Of these, Claim(s) 23 & 31 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Preliminary Matters:

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action falls deficient in its purpose to specifically point out the specific grounds for rejection of each pending claim. With respect to the Leymann '405 reference, the Office Action points only to a single column/line reference directed collectively at each of claims 23-28 and 30-34. With respect to the Ankireddipally '205 reference, the Office Action appears to merely recite the abstract in an apparent blanket rejection of all examined claims 23-28 and 30-34. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the finality of the Office Action be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Leymann, U.S. Patent No. 6,009,405:

Leymann presents a workflow management system (WFMS) for performing generic handling of a variety of transactions between a variety of parties to the transaction. A multitude of resource managers may join and participate in such a transaction (col. 9, line 49- 10:2). The result is a list of multiple updates to various objects and resources (col. 9, line 66-67).

In contrast, the present claims recite an order message format adaptable to an order type element that maps to a particular ordering application.

Therefore, while the transaction of Leymann employs a plurality of resource managers affecting a plurality of objects in an N to M mapping, the present claims map a single order type to a particular ordering application having a specific order response format in an N:1 manner. Accordingly, claim 23 has been herein amended to recite that the order response format correspond[s] to the ordering application.

Further, in an overabundance of caution, Applicant has herein amended claim 23 with the subject matter of claim 27 to clarify that the order response message is mapped to the application database at the ordering application, further clarifying the association between the ordering application and the order response format.

Claim 31, likewise, maintains the N:1 mapping of the order type element to the order response format and corresponding ordering application and DB, by reciting "processing, based on the interacting, the routed order data set by the order processing module to generate an order response message in the order response format, processing further comprising processing in an automated manner that maps data items from the response message at the application database." Accordingly, claims 23 and 31 are deemed distinguishable from the Leymann reference because Leymann does not show, teach or disclose the claimed mapping of the order type element to the order response format and corresponding ordering application and DB. Leymann teaches an arbitrary transaction processing system receiving multiple updates from multiple sources, not a mapping of a specific order type to a specific order response format and ordering application. Accordingly, claim 31 is submitted as distinguished over Leymann.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Ankireddipally, U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0116205:

Ankireddipally teaches a distributed transaction processing system that allows asynchronous, indirect, or broadcast mode ([0042]). The Ankireddipally system, likewise, provides a service supporting multiple contributors for multiple processing outputs (responses) [0062], and does not show teach or disclose the specific mapping of an order type to an order response for receipt by an ordering application. Further, the present claims 23 and 31 further recite that the order type invokes a particular order processing module corresponding to the order type. The order processing modules generate the corresponding order response message in the order response format.

Further, the claimed system parses the order type to determine the appropriate order processing module to pass the order input message to, discussed at page 12, lines 12-19. Neither Leymann nor Ankireddipally shows, teaches or discloses selectively invoking, based on the parsed order type, a particular one of the plurality of order processing modules corresponding to the order type, as claimed in claim 23.

Accordingly, claim 23 has been herein amended to recite that the order message format [is] adaptable to a plurality of order type elements, each order type element corresponding to a different ordering application, and further that the order response format correspond[s] to the ordering application. Ankireddipally makes no showing of a message type in the order type element, operable for routing or dispatching to an order processing module corresponding to the specific order type.

Inasmuch as Ankireddipally may be said to disclose a transaction, such a transaction is merely an XML definition for the multiple inputs and outputs affecting the transaction [0057]. Accordingly, claim 31 has been amended with subject matter of claim 33, to further clarify and distinguish the claimed invention by reciting that the order message and the order response message correspond to a common order transaction between a particular customer and supplier.

-14-

Therefore, claim 30 is further distinguishable from Ankireddipally because Ankireddipally does not show, teach, or disclose the claimed corresponding order message, order response message, and order type.

As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 23 and 31, it is respectfully submitted that all claims in the case are in condition for allowance. Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

Remarks and amendments presented herein are deemed to merely place the case in condition for allowance. It is submitted that no new search is mandated by these amendments because the amendments serve to present previously claimed subject matter in independent form.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

Dated: October 24, 2006